

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 234

SP 007 980

AUTHOR Heffernan-Cabrera, Patricia; Tikunoff, William J.
TITLE Adaptation: CBE + S.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Teacher Interns; Teachers; *Teaching Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

There are three major phases of this competency-based, humanistically oriented adaptation plan for the Teacher Corps program. The first is the adaptation of the national Teacher Corps program to the local Teacher Corps program. This requires adapting the national literature to realistically fit local needs, adapting the national interest and interpretation of a given curriculum to the local program clientele, and involving teachers in a community program that integrates the school into the community as a positive social agency. In the second major phase the Teacher Corps program as conceived by the college or university is adapted to the Teacher Corps program as conceived by the local education agency. This requires the two institutions to share responsibilities; for example, the local school can select from intern candidates who have passed an in-depth selection process and who have requested to work at that particular school site. In the third major phase the Teacher Corps program is adapted to the institutions of higher education through meeting required standards and striving to ensure that everyone feels involved in the decision-making process. In conclusion, the effectiveness of the change process depends on people, and national programs should consist of broad guidelines within which people can adapt their own programs. (PD)

APR 23 1974

MRD 14.08

SP

Patricia Heffernan-Cabrera
William J. Tikunoff

Teacher Corps: Rural-Migrant
School of Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ADAPTATION: CBE + S

a paper presented at
American Education Research Association

April 17, 1974

ED 090234

SP007 980

ADAPTATION: CRE + S

a paper presented at
American Education Research Association

April 17, 1974

Patricia Heffernan-Cabrera
William J. Tikunoff

I. Statement of Problem:

A researcher gets a notion. He advances that notion to some people who have some money or who have some other kinds of support. A staff is put together to operate on that notion with questionnaires, pre-tests, control groups, computer time and perhaps even the Null Hypothesis so that some conclusions can be drawn which could allow one to develop a project provided it were replicated under the exact, same conditions.

Engineers, industrial designers, chemists, have no problem translating such research into a product, but educators do because educators must deal with human beings and all of the conditions inherent in being human. Those conditions may be mode o'day or the soup du jour but they constitute vectors which are in vogue politically, socially, philosophically. Thus we arrive at the problem -- an educational idea gains substance and relevance only when it has been adapted to fit the needs of a community of "selves" or those beings who would use it.

This is no easy task. For example, in order to implement an idea which an educator believes to have merit, he often must write a proposal to secure funding. The process of Adaptation has begun. One "self" has been responsive to a set of governmental guidelines -- a political vector and conceptualized an idea. In order to promote the idea he must now involve "selves" from other publics: the host institution, the public schools, the "community", professional organizations. Each of the "selves" brings to the implementation of the idea his own set -- political, social and philosophical. Each of these necessitates an accommodation as part of the process of adaptation.

He is funded. He must now operationalize the idea. All of the initial steps of adaptation previously taken were taken in absentia of yet other "selves" -- those upon whom he is dependent for the implementation of his idea. They may be teachers-in-training, teachers-in-service, young children, unwed mothers, troubled youth, new careerists, leisure learners -- any one of which represents multipliers on the continuum of social, political and philosophical vectors.

The foregoing scenario might seem discouraging because of the schizophrenia with which his original idea is encumbered. The need for these "self"-involving exercises becomes apparent when we examine adapta-

tion as a process of broad humanistic dimensions. And so to our title, "Adaptation: CBE + S."

Our good friend and colleague Roy Fairfield of the Union Graduate School has proposed that we can overcome the antipathy for CBE by inserting the S -- the "self" -- thereby accomplishing Competency Based Self Education. We submit that the inclusion of the "self" will not only ameliorate the disaffection for CBE as a system but is in fact critical to its adoption, i.e., that without the flexibility for adaptation by those who would be charged to use the system there will be no adoption except as mandated by law -- and what is that in a free society!

Definition: Adaptation as Process:

In pursuing a definition of "adaptation", it is tempting to view such a term from the limited scope of a researcher, a materials developer, a "practitioner", or a member of the specific clientele. Such a view, however, envisions adaptation as a product to be used to a specific end. Thus, the developer of materials might well see "adaptation" as the operationalizing of his product; too, the researcher, if he is concerned with "adaptation", need know only that his findings have generated the need for a product or the basis for a curriculum. It seems to us that such defining of "adaptation" is limited, mechanistic, and oblivious of "adaptation" as a process including and involving each contributing component.

We can best compare such a process to a recorded symphony. The original idea first occurred to the composer; it was he who experimented, who committed an arrangement of notes to a page which he labeled a composition, and who was subsequently recognized as the originator of an idea, the composer. In order for the composition to be heard, however, it had to go through the process of adaptation. A second step involved the arranger, who through the process of adaptation would then adapt the composition for a full orchestra by arranging each component part for the various instruments in the orchestra and we know that, as time progressed and more instruments were invented, earlier pieces of music had to be rearranged (re-adapted, if you will) to include the growing numbers of players and instruments in the orchestra.

Ultimately, the conductor is responsible for the composition when it is played, for it is he who interprets the score and directs the various instruments in the orchestra. Even so, each musician has ultimate influence over how his particular instrument contributes to the total sound.

It is this complete orchestration of a composition which can best serve as a metaphor for the concept of "adaptation as a process" that we are advocating. No one individual involved in the process -- which begins with the hypothesis of an idea and ends with its implementation -- can exist in a vacuum. A researcher, for instance, must know that his data will be utilized ultimately to produce a product which will be used by people. It is not the adapted product, however, which assumes ultimate importance; it is, instead, the process of adaptation of idea-to-implementation which is important. Like the orchestration of a musical composition, the process of adaptation in the implementation of educational ideas is a responsive system including and involving each of its contributing and participating component parts.

Adaptation, then, is a process which benefits most those who would become involved in it. James Squires said, "Every curriculum should have a built-in self-detonating device;" by this he inferred that, once produced, any curriculum is merely the recorded history of a process through which a group of people have come. To assume that the product, e.g., the "curriculum" produced, should be used intact without itself experiencing the process of adaptation is to follow the folly of those who would legislate morality by prescribing for others in their absence.

We rather like the prince who searched for Cinderella and couldn't find happiness until he found her -- because only her foot fit the glass slipper. One can look a long time for a Cinderella clientele to use successfully a product designed to fit only it.

To further contextualize our notion that adaptation = CBE + S, we would cite for you our own experiences with Teacher Corps as a national program as it had to be adapted to a local site.

Teacher Corps is a program that is legislated to bring about change and processes which improve the delivery of education to children in under-developed areas. These areas may be concerned with curriculum because of a specific clientele, such as migrant, bi-lingual, urban, rural children; or they may be concerned with evolving a delivery system such as CBTE (and we all know what that means). In any event, those of us who have sought to advance our notions via Teacher Corps have realized that we must not only work with one given public (pre-service adults) in one setting (the local public schools) as representatives of one institution of higher education, but we must also accomodate the special interests of a national program.

The Local Teacher Corps Program and the National Teacher Corps

In the beginning, the very first adaptation that one had to make was upon the national literature. It was so emotional and unrealistic in its recruitment statements that one had to immediately move to adapt the pre-conceived notions of the young recruits relative to what their roles in Teacher Corps would be with the long-standing notions of a local education agency relative to what their roles could be. If one did not help local programs begin to adapt to who these young missionaries were and how they were charged up to change as well as help the recruits recognize that change is facilitated by strategy, you were in for an aborted program by January. This adaptation had to be done before any final selection was made. By revealing the "givens and musts", those who felt that they would not be able to work within the framework of the "could ncts" could better choose whether to come into Teacher Corps or to look elsewhere.

Over the years even though the literature promises less authority for change to the teacher-to-be, we have continually recruited and selected in our adaptive mode. No one is selected who has not been to site; been presented with the potential to change with which that LEA can live; made his choice as an independent self to be interviewed; been personally interviewed by a panel of one ex-intern, one ex-team leader, one teacher from the school site, one teacher from the professional organization, the building principal, the LEA coordinator, two parents from the community and,

one member of the USC Teacher Corps Migrant staff; and been selected in that same group as the candidate that they are willing to sponsor and support for the learning time. Sister Conta did a poster for Teacher Corps one year which noted that TC was a two-way street. As one young Mexican-American remarked: "I thought that I'd come and you'd try to sell me on coming into Teacher Corps; but I see that I must also sell myself."

A second adaptation to be made in this phase is that of the national interest and interpretation of a given curriculum to the clientele in one's program. In the past, the national thrust has been concentrated on special education, a community-based education or team teaching a Volunteer Teacher Corps. Now its competency Based Education. One's clientele determines whether one can do a "lay-on" of minute boxes with finite objectives which are nicely modularized and delivered via a tight efficient management system. It has been our experience in California with our clientele under 28 years of age and of an emergent minority that they demand a VOICE in design, in delivery, in evaluation and even in management; that adaptation takes longer, requires more involvement and necessitates authority figures delegating some of their authority. Thus the "selves" take hold of CBTE or CBE and make it their own.

The third major adaptation within this phase of adaptation that must be made between national perception and local persuasion is that which has to do with community involvement. So many times interns or militant interests in a community have attempted to use community involvement to politicize a program. What occurs is a subsequent disaffection between the program and the local education agency and sometimes with dramatic affect. The adaptation is one of mind-set which says to a teacher-to-be that the reason for community involvement is not to rape a system politically with the hope for change; but to involve teachers and schools in a community's striving -- in community service if you will -- thereby integrating that school into that community as a positive social agency with the last opportunity for public debate in open forum -- the school board meeting.

All of these adaptations of the national interests to fit local potential and readiness are predicated on the involvement of others in the adaptation process -- those other "selves" who must in Paolo Friere's words be "able to name their world before they can own it."

THE TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM AND THE LEA

Once one moves into a local posture there begins a second major phase in adaptation which has to do with adapting the Teacher Corps Program, as conceived by the college or university with the Teacher Corps Program as conceived by the local education agency. This is the highest order of collaboration or what is plainly described as the sharing of responsibilities. Unless there is co-ownership of a project such as Teacher Corps, overzealous interns who get over-charged about something that they are doing very quickly become "your" interns rather than "our" interns.

Remember our adaptation of the selection process. In the past, Teacher Corps members at each University were selected as one group, a total public. They were then divided into working teams for the schools who bid upon them. An intern did not always get the school he wanted nor

did the schools participate in the initial selection of their teachers. The recruits for T.C. Migrant, the ones who think they want to be in Teacher Corps, come into a selection process which is an in-depth process, and after they have an opportunity to get an overview of the different sites in which one might work, as well as the different educational levels they opt the beginning of the self-determining process: they select the school site in which they would like to work and schedule an interview with that selection team.

They are gambling. If there are six sites and they decide they only like one then they only get one chance. Some of them for security's sake who "want" more than others opt all six. But in any event they have made their first choice. The candidates who are chosen in the final selection process are those who want to be in that LEA and who are really wanted by that local education agency. Also, the LEAs have accepted the responsibility for the success of those people who are coming into "our" Teacher Corps program.

The next local adaptation that the USC Teacher Corps: Migrant Program made was in the matter of the team structure. For a long time in working with Teacher Corps we discovered how difficult it was to integrate new interns into the on-going machinery of the institutional system. In many cases they were tolerated, used as Teacher Aids, and made to feel a lack of respect, whether it was due to jealousy, lack of time, or lack of understanding as to what Teacher Corps was all about. For whatever the reason, teachers who were on contract and with tenure tended to be able to do without Teacher Corps very well. Our closest allies tended to be the new young teachers. They were in their first one or two years of teaching, needed help, and wanted change, new ideas and nurturance. Our challenge was "What to do about this?" since it seemed that the installation of change (which is a mandate of all rational Teacher Corps programs) could not occur without greater involvement of the tenured faculty -- in truth, the waters would simply close over the rocks dropped in the pond once the program had ended. So we determined that in order to install change we needed to amend the structure: to adapt the teamness of Teacher Corps.

We proposed that a team should be composed of x-number of members who were teachers already on contract, and who already had tenure as well as x-number of teaching cadets. All would get the same reward: a Master of Science in Education. The teaching cadets would also get a teaching credential.

One of the most difficult tasks in this adaptation of the traditional Teacher Corps model has been the breaking down of status and the installation of "peerness". Once, one of the team members asked if, because he had five years' teaching experience, he would have to evaluate the incoming teacher cadets. We promptly replied, "NO." It is very easy for tenure and years of experience to seek to gain ascendancy when it is time to make a team decision thus making participative decisionmaking a most difficult task. We have continued to spend a great deal of time maintaining this "peerness" in a team.

We have found that the pre-service cadet can more quickly move into the school structure under the aegis of being in harness with colleagues of the other teachers in the school. They no longer are "scabs" who are hanging on in some Federal program called Teacher Corps. They are now accepted

and facilitated not only by their fellow team members but by another adaptation which we believe to be critical.

That adaptation is a change in the traditional Teacher Corps leadership role. We determined that it is very difficult for a teacher, master though she may be, to be plucked from the classroom and overnight made into a "Team Leader" and a clinical professor with responsibility for 7-9 hotshot graduate students. We concluded that perhaps a masterful teacher or a master teacher with children was not necessarily one who could cope with the philosophical, social, and political mind-sets of the kind of young person who comes into Teacher Corps.

Also there was the consideration of the matter of change. In the past, our team leaders have risen into leadership roles; nevertheless, their impact during time of service has been questionable. We, therefore, determined that to ensure the installation of change in the local education agency, the person who should be Team Leader was the building principal or the person responsible for curriculum and instruction, as in the case of the junior and senior high school.

We proposed to secure the services of that person by suggesting that an administrative intern be considered by the local education agency, preferably a member of an ethnic minority group who had potential, who could then intern with the principal or assistant principal, thus relieving the principal or the assistant principal of certain cumbersome jobs and freeing him to be a team leader.

We are actually re-training building principals and assistant principals as instructional leaders -- a most exciting prospect. The payoff in this adaptation leads us to believe that the changes that have been initiated will continue once we have gone, because there are 6 people in each of the sites with the building principal, who have had the opportunity to participate with Teacher Corps as they have explored certain "cutting-edge" programs.

We could not end this portion of our discussion of adaptation without speaking to one of the major difficulties: adapting the psychological set of the in-service teachers to a competency based education. They are so accustomed to "course-work", -- to attending classes, to taking exams that regurgitate lecture notes and textbooks, to having deadlines set for them -- that entry into a self-pacing, competency based program is sometimes immobilizing.

Pre-service cadets seem to have little trouble with this, and their flexibility and ability to learn within an open-ended structure has helped. Each team has adapted the various talents of its members to attack course-work as a team; thus, a module of instruction is studied by an entire team, with everyone contributing and with timelines negotiated to best fit a given school site and the learning styles of its members.

An important notion that is derived as a result of this adaptation of each Self to CBE is that team members can help each other in the process of learning, negating the traditional dictum that to know, one must do all for himself.

Probably the last adaptation within the framework of adapting the Teacher Corps Program to the local education agency has to do with the matter of participative management. We were able to adapt a theoretical model (The ComField Model which grew out of the Oregon Elementary Education Models) into a viable instrument, for participative management. The notion of collaboration, of participative decision-making, of allowing for in-puts into the design of a higher education curriculum which we have nominated as a humanistic-competency-based-teacher-education-program -- was no small feat. Oh yes, we have modules, flow charts and we have staged seminars, workshops, symposia, colloquia -- all manners of technical assistance in-puts; but the decisions of HOW a participant strives to achieve a terminal objective is a process that he chooses and selects. This adaptation has been the most radical to achieve, but the most rewarding.

THE TEACHER CORPS AND THE IHE

The third major set of adaptations that are critical to Teacher Corps are those of adapting the Teacher Corps program to the institution of higher education. The notion of "changing the institution" is prevalent in Teacher Corps literature. Although the notion encompasses both the LEA and the IHE, the term "institution" is frequently interpreted to mean the institution of higher education (you might reconsider that "your" vs. "our" intern mentality). When one is fortunate enough to receive a Teacher Corps program all participating institutions are subject to change. This is a Teacher Corps mandate.

In the LEA that change -- whatever those new ideas are, whatever kinds of innovations you might have been successful in introducing it is hoped -- will be substantiated by a maintenance of effort. Such maintenance of effort could mean that the changes will be continued once the program has gone, or that they, too, will become adapted into new programs by the local education agency. Our past track record suggests that we have been successful in leaving behind bilingual programs, ESL programs, Learning Centers, Multi-purpose schools, portal schools.

The second thrust has to do with the institution of higher education. One must be continually concerned with its "standards." Those standards come into play at the moment of selection. Are you violating the GPA, the GRE and all the other letters in the alphabet soup that makes up the traditional entrance procedure? The idea that you are working in units of competencies attainment and not in coursework credit is equally difficult to communicate within the higher ed. structure, particularly to the registrar. One almost gets into the game of cheating the computer in order to accommodate the notion that some things take longer and some things take less time than a given semester's or quarter's unit of time. We believe these to be adaptations on a theme that will be reviewed someday and will hopefully be installed.

Another dimension of adaptation in the IHE has to do with the information flow and workshops for peers. How do you help everybody know what's going on at the same time so that everyone feels that he is involved in participating in the decisionmaking process? How do you help them help each other? It is one thing for you to offer technical assistance. You can be the mama bird dropping the food into the mouth of her babes. However a very important adaptation in all of the schizophrenia of new program development is that each person begins to realize the strength of his own resources and

that with some adaptation he himself becomes a source of technical assistance to his peers.

We believe all of this to be important because we are talking about people in these institutions. You cannot mandate change in an institution, but you can change the people in those institutions. You must operate on the "Selfs" that make up any given institution, whether it is the public school or the institution of higher education. Adaptation is dependent upon the people involving themselves in orchestrating the change process, of attending to and ordering the vectoring forces which impinge upon their local situation. There is no way that a national program can lay out a blue print. They can however lay out broad guidelines within which people can adapt their programs. With competency based education it is the same thing. The flow chart itself is a broad guideline, and there are many routes that one can take in order to complete a Terminal Objective.

CBE without the involvement of the "Selfs" -- CBE without the S -- is little more than an attempt to install a product as a curricular-instructional change only. There is no guarantee that anybody will take it, name it, and own it because he has adapted it to fit himself. In our opinion, to mandate institutional change, to accommodate a product without allowing for the adaptation, is the highest degree of perseveration

There is an episode in Saul Bass' film, Why Man Creates, that depicts a dialogue between two erudite snails. Suddenly awakened by an idea, the first says to the second, bringing him out of an equally deep sleep, "Have you ever noticed how individuals breed radical ideas that threaten institutions, then become accepted and replace the institutions they threatened?"

Snail #2: "No."

Snail #1: "Hmmm. For a second there I thought I had something."

And they both go back to sleep.